arXiv:quant-ph/0104096v1 19 Apr 2001

Generation of two-mode nonclassical motional states and a Fredkin gate operation in a two-dimensional ion trap

Xu-Bo Zou, Jaewan Kim*, and Hai-Woong Lee†
Department of Physics, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Taejon 305-701,Korea

(Dated: February 1, 2008)

We present an efficient scheme to generate two-mode SU(2) macroscopic quantum superposition (Schrödinger cat) states, entangled number states and entangled coherent states for the vibrational motion of an ion trapped in a two-dimensional harmonic potential well. We also show that the same scheme can be used to realize a Fredkin gate operation.

PACS numbers: 42.50.Dv, 03.67.Lx

The generation of nonclassical states has been widely studied in the past both in theory and in experiment. The first significant advances were made in quantum optics with a successful experimental demonstration of antibunched light[1] and squeezed light[2]. Various optical schemes of generating macroscopic quantum superposition (Schrödinger cat) states have also been studied[3], which led to an experimental realization in a quantized cavity field[4]. Recently, possible ways of generating various two-mode entangled field states have been proposed. For example, it has been shown[5] that entangled coherent state, which is obtained when two-mode coherent states are superposed[5, 6] and may thus be considered as a two(multi)-mode generalization of single-mode Schrödinger cat states[7], can be produced using the nonlinear Mach-Zehnder interferometer. A method to generate another type of two-mode Schrödinger cat states known as SU(2) Schrödinger cat state, which results when two different SU(2) coherent states[8, 9, 10] are superposed, has also been proposed[9, 10]. It has also been shown that two-mode entangled number states can be generated using nonlinear optical interactions[11], which may then be used to obtain the maximum sensitivity in phase measurements set by the Heisenberg limit[12] . In general, however, experimental realization of nonclassical field states is difficult, because quantum coherence characterizing these states is easily destroyed by interaction with the environment.

Recent advances in ion cooling and trapping have opened new prospects in nonclassical state generation. An ion confined in an electromagnetic trap can be approximately described as a particle in a harmonic potential with its center of mass (c.m.) exhibiting quantum-mechanical simple harmonic motion. By appropriately driving the ion with laser fields, its internal and external degrees of freedom can be coupled to the extent that its center-of-mass motion can be manipulated with relative ease. One advantage of the trapped-ion system is that the decoherence effect is relatively weak due to the extremely weak coupling between the vibrational modes and the environment. It was realized that this advantage of the trapped ion system makes it a promising candidate for constructing quantum logic gates for quantum computation[13] as well as for producing nonclassical states of the center-of-mass vibrational motion. In fact, the controlled-NOT gate has been experimentally realized with trapped ions in a linear chain[14]. At the same time single-mode nonclassical states, such as Fock states, squeezed states and Schrödinger cat states, of the ion's vibrational motion have been theoretically investigated[15, 16] and experimentally realized[17] with the trapped ion system. Most recently, various schemes of producing two-mode nonclassical states of the vibrational motion have been proposed using ions confined in a two-dimensional trap[16, 18, 19].

In this paper, we propose an efficient scheme to generate two-mode SU(2) Schrödinger cat states, entangled number states and entangled coherent states of the vibrational motion of an ion in a two-dimensional harmonic potential. We also show that the same scheme can be used to construct a Fredkin gate (controlled-exchange gate)[20]. The optical Fredkin gate can be built using two beam splitters and a Kerr medium[21]. It has been shown that it needs six two-qubit operations to construct a Fredkin gate[22]. The optical Fredkin gate has given a simple implementation of the quantum computer to solve Deutsch's problem[23]. Note that, using dual-rail representation[24, 25], the optical Fredkin gate corresponds to a controlled-NOT gate; in this sense, the optical Fredkin gate can be used to synthesize any quantum computing devices[23, 25].

Our scheme relies on the interactions

$$H_1 = \hbar\Omega_1(a^\dagger b + ab^\dagger)\sigma_x \tag{1}$$

and

$$H_2 = \hbar\Omega_2(a^\dagger b + ab^\dagger)\ , \tag{2}$$

where $(a, a^\dagger)$ and $(b, b^\dagger)$ are the boson annihilation and creation operators for the two c.m. modes in the x and y directions, respectively, σ_x is the Pauli spin matrix operating on the internal two levels of the ion, and Ω_1 and Ω_2 represent the strength of the respective interactions. The interaction (1) can be realized in a trapped ion system in a two-dimensional potential in the Lamb-Dicke

---

*On leave from Samsung Advanced Institute of Technology

†E-mail address: hwlee@laputa.kaist.ac.kr

limit by applying two symmetrically positioned pairs of Raman lasers, with the first pair tuned to the first red sidebands of the ion vibration in the x and y directions, respectively, and the second pair tuned to the first blue sidebands[26]. The interaction (2) gives parametric coupling of the two vibrational modes and has already been employed by various authors for the purpose of manipulating the ion system[12, 18, 27].

We first consider the situation in which the ion is prepared in the ground state $|\downarrow\rangle$ and the two c.m. modes in the Fock states $|0\rangle_a$ and $|n\rangle_b$, respectively,

$$|\Psi(t=0)\rangle = |\downarrow\rangle|0\rangle_a|n\rangle_b \ . \tag{3}$$

If laser pulses of interaction (1) is applied, the system evolves to

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(t)\rangle = \ & \frac{1}{2}\exp[-i\Omega_1 t(a^\dagger b + ab^\dagger)](|\downarrow\rangle + |\uparrow\rangle)|0\rangle_a|n\rangle_b \\ & + \frac{1}{2}\exp[i\Omega_1 t(a^\dagger b + ab^\dagger)](|\downarrow\rangle - |\uparrow\rangle)|0\rangle_a|n\rangle_b \ . \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Upon detection of the ion state, the state vector is projected into

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_\pm\rangle = \ & \exp[-i\Omega_1 t(a^\dagger b + ab^\dagger)]|0\rangle_a|n\rangle_b \\ & \pm\exp[i\Omega_1 t(a^\dagger b + ab^\dagger)]|0\rangle_a|n\rangle_b \ , \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $|\Psi_+\rangle$ is obtained if the state $|\downarrow\rangle$ of the ion is detected, and $|\Psi_-\rangle$ if the upper state $|\uparrow\rangle$ is detected. The state (5) is the SU(2) Schrödinger cat state of the form $(|\zeta, j\rangle \pm |-\zeta, j\rangle)$[10], where $|\zeta, j\rangle = \exp[\beta J_+ - \beta^* J_-]|j, -j\rangle$ is the SU(2) coherent state[8], if the identification is made as $\beta = -i\Omega_1 t$, $j = n/2$, and $\zeta = -i\tan(\Omega_1 t/2)$.

If the interactions (1) and (2) are applied in succession to the initial state (3) and the durations t_1 and t_2 of the respective interactions are chosen to be $\Omega_1 t_1 = \Omega_2 t_2 = \pi/4$, the system evolves to

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(t = t_1 + t_2)\rangle = \ & \frac{1}{2} i^n (|\downarrow\rangle + |\uparrow\rangle)|n\rangle_a|0\rangle_b \\ & + \frac{1}{2}(|\downarrow\rangle - |\uparrow\rangle)|0\rangle_a|n\rangle_b \ . \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Upon detection of the ion state, the state (6) collapses to

$$|\Psi_\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(i^n|n\rangle_a|0\rangle_b \pm |0\rangle_a|n\rangle_b) \ , \tag{7}$$

which is the entangled number state.

We next consider the case where the ion is in the ground state $|\downarrow\rangle$ and the two c.m. modes are prepared in coherent states $|\alpha\rangle_a$ and $|\beta\rangle_b$, respectively,

$$|\Psi(t=0)\rangle = |\downarrow\rangle|\alpha\rangle_a|\beta\rangle_b \ . \tag{8}$$

If the interactions (1) and (2) are applied in succession and the interaction times are chosen again as $\Omega_1 t_1 = \Omega_2 t_2 = \pi/4$, the system evolves to

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(t = t_1 + t_2)\rangle = \ & \frac{|\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle}{2}|i\beta\rangle_a|i\alpha\rangle_b \\ & + \frac{|\downarrow\rangle - |\uparrow\rangle}{2}|\alpha\rangle_a|\beta\rangle_b \ . \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Upon detection of the ion state, the state vector collapses to

$$|\Psi_\pm\rangle = |\alpha\rangle_a|\beta\rangle_b \pm |i\beta\rangle_a|i\alpha\rangle_b \tag{10}$$

which is the entangled coherent state or the two-mode Schrödinger cat state. If the interaction times t_1 and t_2 are chosen as $\Omega_1 t_1 = \Omega_2 t_2 = \dfrac{\pi}{2}$, the initial state (8) evolves to

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(t = t_1 + t_2)\rangle = \ & \frac{|\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle}{2}|-\alpha\rangle_a|-\beta\rangle_b \\ & + \frac{|\downarrow\rangle - |\uparrow\rangle}{2}|\alpha\rangle_a|\beta\rangle_b \ . \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

If the atom is detected in the ground state or the excited state, the state vector collapses to

$$|\Psi_\pm\rangle = |-\alpha\rangle_a|-\beta\rangle_b \pm |\alpha\rangle_a|\beta\rangle_b \ , \tag{11}$$

which is also the entangled coherent state.

Finally we consider the case when the ion is prepared in the symmetric state $|+\rangle = (|\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ or the antisymmetric state $|-\rangle = (|\uparrow\rangle - |\downarrow\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, and the two c.m. modes are prepared in either $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$. When the two interactions (1) and (2) are applied in succession with $\Omega_1 t_1 = \Omega_2 t_2 = \pi/4$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |-\rangle|i\rangle_a|j\rangle_b &\longrightarrow |-\rangle|i\rangle_a|j\rangle_b \qquad (i, j = 0, 1) \ , \\ |+\rangle|0\rangle_a|0\rangle_b &\longrightarrow |+\rangle|0\rangle_a|0\rangle_b \ , \\ |+\rangle|0\rangle_a|1\rangle_b &\longrightarrow i|+\rangle|1\rangle_a|0\rangle_b \ , \\ |+\rangle|1\rangle_a|0\rangle_b &\longrightarrow i|+\rangle|0\rangle_a|1\rangle_b \ , \\ |+\rangle|1\rangle_a|1\rangle_b &\longrightarrow -1|+\rangle|1\rangle_a|1\rangle_b \ , \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where the state to the left of the arrow represents the initial state and the state to the right is the state at $t = t_1 + t_2$. Eq. (13) represents a Fredkin gate operation[20], apart from phase factors that can be eliminated by an appropriate setting of the phase of subsequent logic operations[28].

In summary, we have presented an efficient scheme that generates SU(2) Schrödinger cat states, entangled number states, and entangled coherent states and that gives a Fredkin gate operation in a trapped ion. It should be pointed out that our proposed scheme for generating nonclassical motional states is not deterministic, because the generation is accomplished via post selection, i.e., selective measurement of a product state after the state has been produced. Whether the final motional state we obtain is $|\Psi_+\rangle$ or $|\Psi_-\rangle$ of Eq. (5) [the argument applies equally to Eqs. (7), (10), or (12)] depends upon the outcome of the measurement of the internal state of the ion. When a particular state $|\Psi_+\rangle$ (or $|\Psi_-\rangle$) is desired, our method cannot always succeed; the probability of success is 50%. It should also be pointed out that our analysis assumes a perfectly isolated system. In a real experiment, the quantum motion of a trapped ion is obviously limited by sources of decoherence. One most important source is the heating of the motion of the ions, which appears to be due to the ambient fluctuating electrical field in the trap. There have been several theoretical investigations on the heating of trapped ions[29, 30, 31]. In a recent experiment in a Paul trap[32], the heating rate has been measured to be sufficiently low that, for relatively large traps, heating may not be a critically limiting process. The ability to engineer quantum state as well as the small heating rates in experiments[32] lead us to hope that our present scheme may be realized experimentally in a near future.

This research was supported by the Brain Korea 21 Project of the Korean Ministry of Education, by the Korea Science and Engineering Foundation under Contract No. 1999-2-121-005-3, and by the Korea Atomic Energy Research Institute.

---

[1] See, for a review, H. Paul, Rev. Mod. Phys. **54**, 1061 (1982); R. Loudon, Rep. Prog. Phys. **43**, 913 (1980).

[2] See, for a review, R. Loudon and P. L. Knight, J. Mod. Opt. **34**, 709 (1987).

[3] B. Yurke and D. Stoler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 13 (1986); B. Yurke and D. Stoler, Phys. Rev. A **35**, 4846 (1987); M. Brune, S. Haroche, J. M. Raimond, L. Davidovich, and N. Zagury, *ibid.* **45**, 5193 (1992).

[4] M. Brune, E. Hagley, J. Dreyer, X. Maitre, A. Maali, C. Wunderlich, J. M. Raimond, and S. Haroche, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 4887 (1996).

[5] B. C. Sanders, Phys. Rev. A **45**, 6811 (1992); B. C. Sanders and D. A. Rice, *ibid.* **61**, 013805 (1999).

[6] C. L. Chai, Phys. Rev. A **46**, 7187 (1992).

[7] N. A. Ansari and V. I. Man'ko, Phys. Rev. A **50**, 1942 (1994); V. V. Dodonov, V. I. Man'ko, and D. E. Nikonov, *ibid.* **51**, 3328 (1995).

[8] V. Buzek and T. Quang, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **6**, 2447 (1989).

[9] B. C. Sanders, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 2417 (1989).

[10] C. C. Gerry and R. Grobe, J. Mod. Opt. **44**, 41 (1997).

[11] C. C. Gerry, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 043811 (2000).

[12] J. J. Bollinger, W. M. Itano, D. J. Wineland, and D. J. Heinzen, Phys. Rev. A **54**, R4649 (1996).

[13] J. I. Cirac and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4091 (1995).

[14] C. Monroe, D. M. Meekhof, B. E. King, W. M. Itano, and D. J. Wineland, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 4714 (1995).

[15] J. I. Cirac, R. Blatt, A. S. Parkins, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 762 (1993); J. I. Cirac, A. S. Parkins, R. Blatt, and P. Zoller, *ibid.* **70**, 556 (1993); R. L. de Matos Filho and W. Vogel, *ibid.* **76**, 608 (1996); J. F. Poyatos, J. I. Cirac, R. Blatt, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1532 (1996); S. B. Zheng, *ibid.* **58**, 761 (1998).

[16] C. C. Gerry, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 2478 (1997).

[17] D. M. Meekhof, C. Monroe, B. E. King, W. M. Itano, and D. J. Wineland, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 1796 (1996); C. Monroe, D. M. Meekhof, B. E. King, and D. J. Wineland, Science **272**, 1131 (1996).

[18] S. C. Gou and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1682 (1996).

[19] S. C. Gou, J. Steinbach, and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. A **54**, R1014 (1996); S. C. Gou, J. Steinbach, and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 4315 (1996); S. Maniscalco, A. Messina, and A. Napoli, *ibid.* **61**, 053806 (2000).

[20] E. Fredkin and T. Toffoli, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **21**, 219 (1982).

[21] G. J. Milburn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 2124 (1989).

[22] H. F. Chau and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 748 (1995).

[23] I. L. Chuang and Y. Yamamoto, Phys. Rev. A **52**, 3489 (1995).

[24] I. L. Chuang and Y. Yamamoto, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 4281 (1996).

[25] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).

[26] J. Steinbach, J. Twamley, and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 4815 (1997).

[27] D. J. Heinzen and D. J. Wineland, Phys. Rev. A **42**, 2977 (1990).

[28] D. J. Wineland, C. Monroe, W. M. Itano, D. Leibfried, B. E. King, and D. M. Meekhof, J. Res. Natl. Inst. Stand. Technol. **103**, 259 (1998); A. Barenco, D. Deutsch, A. Ekert, and R. Jozsa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4083 (1995).

[29] S. K. Lamoreaux, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 4970 (1997).

[30] D. F. V. James, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 317 (1998).

[31] S. Schneider and G. J. Milburn, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 3766 (1999).

[32] Ch. Roos, Th. Zeiger, H. Rohde, H. C. Nägerl, J. Eschner, D. Leibfried, F. Schmidt-Kaler, and R. Blatt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4713 (1999).